

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 436

SP 027 705

AUTHOR Warren, Richard D.; And Others
TITLE Follow-Up Study of Teacher Education Graduates.
General Frequency Report. Report No. 2 in the Iowa
State University Teacher Evaluation Project, March
1982.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames.
Research Inst. for Studies in Education.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 51p.; For related documents, see SP 027 704-706.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Preservice
Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program
Evaluation; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Education
Programs; Teacher Employment; *Teaching
(Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa State University

ABSTRACT

This study represents one phase of a larger research effort directed at the development and testing of a comprehensive teacher education evaluation model. The study focused primarily on obtaining attitudinal and occupational information from graduates of the Iowa State teacher education program one year after graduation. Student perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of the teacher education program, student employment patterns, student attitudes toward their current employment, their employment plans for the future, and characteristics of current employment were examined. One hundred seventy-one graduates returned a completed questionnaire. Results are presented in the form of tables and brief summaries of written-in responses. Information is provided on: (1) general graduate characteristics; (2) graduates employed in teaching; (3) graduates employed outside teaching; (4) program evaluation; (5) evaluations of selected program areas; (6) current employment characteristics; and (7) comparison of teachers and non-teachers on occupational variables. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED270436

Follow-Up Study of Teacher Education Graduates

General Frequency Report

Report No. 2 in the Iowa State University
Teacher Education Evaluation Project
March 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Breiter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP027705

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF FIRST YEAR
IOWA STATE TEACHER EDUCATION GRADUATES

General Frequency Report

by

Richard D. Warren
Harold E. Dilts
Ann D. Thompson
Marilyn H. Blaustein

With the assistance of

May Chen
Diane James

*
* Report No. 2 in the Iowa State University *
* Teacher Education Evaluation Project *
*

Research Institute for Studies in Education
College of Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
March, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
RESULTS	3
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS	3
GRADUATES EMPLOYED IN TEACHING	7
GRADUATES EMPLOYED OUTSIDE TEACHING	11
PROGRAM EVALUATION	14
EVALUATIONS OF SELECTED AREAS	21
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS	25
COMPARISON OF TEACHERS AND NON-TEACHERS ON OCCUPATIONAL VARIABLES	28
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	37
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	40
 <u>Appendix</u>	 <u>page</u>
RESPONDENTS COMPARED WITH NON-RESPONDENTS	41

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
1. General Characteristics	4
2. Teaching Characteristics	5
3. Approval Areas (Secondary)	6
4. Teachers' Current Employment Status and Plans	8
5. Subject Areas Being Taught (Secondary)	9
6. Non-Teachers' Current Employment Status and Career Plans	12
7. Non-Teachers' Long-Range Plans	13
8. Evaluations of Teacher Education	15
9. Most Valuable Professional Preparation Areas	17
10. Areas in Which More Preparation Should Have Been Offered	19
11. Adequacy And Importance For Preparation Areas	23
12. Factors in Accepting Current Position	26
13. Satisfaction With Current Position And Population of Community in Which Graduates Were Employed	27
14. Characteristics of Best Teacher	28
15. Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Academic, Job and Program Variables	29
16. Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Demographic Characteristics . .	31
17. Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Occupational Characteristics . .	34
18. Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Job Selection Factors	36
19. Respondents Compared With Non-Respondents on Academic Characteristics	42
20. Respondents Compared With Non-Respondents on Selected Characteristics	43
21. Teaching Status in 1981 Compared With Response to Questionnaire in 1980	46

INTRODUCTION

The first year follow-up study¹ focused primarily on obtaining attitudinal and occupational information from graduates of the Iowa State teacher education program one year after graduation. In the study, student perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of the teacher education program, student employment patterns, student attitudes toward their current employment, their employment plans for the future, and characteristics of current employment were examined. Since the majority of these first year graduates were surveyed at the time of their graduation in Spring, 1980, a long-range purpose of the study will be to compare student responses at the time of graduation and their responses at planned intervals following graduation. This initial frequency report, however, describes only the results from the first year follow-up study.

The primary objectives of this study of first year teacher education graduates were:

1. To obtain baseline data on these graduates for longitudinal analyses regarding the teacher education program and its participants.

¹The study reported here represents one phase of a larger RISE research effort directed at the development and testing of a comprehensive teacher education evaluation model.

2. To determine the graduates' attitudes and opinions about selected aspects of the teacher education program at Iowa State University.
3. To elicit ideas and suggestions for improving the current teacher education program.
4. To obtain information about the types of occupations in which first year graduates are now employed, and to obtain information about their satisfaction with and characteristics of their current positions.
5. To compare graduates who are teaching with graduates who are employed outside of teaching regarding demographic characteristics, achievement measures, and occupational values.

The study of the first year teacher education graduates was conducted during Spring, 1981. Questionnaires were sent to the 268 graduates who graduated and were approved for teaching in Spring, 1980. The majority of these graduates participated in a similar study at the time of their graduation.

The initial questionnaire was sent in April, 1981. Graduates who had not returned the questionnaire within two weeks received a second letter and another copy of the questionnaire. Those who had not returned a completed questionnaire after the second mailing received a reminder postcard two weeks after this mailing. One hundred seventy-one graduates (64%) returned a completed questionnaire. When respondents and non-respondents were compared on selected characteristics, the results suggested that the respondents were a representative group of the graduates (Appendix).

RESULTS

In this section of the report, results from the respondents to the survey are presented. Open-ended responses were summarized through categories derived from the written-in responses provided by the graduates (Tables 9 and 10). In the remaining tables, the categories reported were taken directly from the questionnaires.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The majority of the respondents were female (80%), single (60%), and reported spending most of their lives thus far on a farm or in a small town (51%) (Table 1). The majority indicated that their yearly income was in the \$10,000 - \$19,000 range with 29 percent below and 20 percent above this range.

Sixty-three percent of the respondents reported that they currently had a teaching position whereas 36 percent reported being employed in a non-teaching position. One percent (N=2) of the respondents reported that they were currently unemployed (Table 2).

Almost half of the respondents reported that their student teaching experience was on the secondary level, 30 percent reported the elementary level and 12 percent reported the nursery/kindergarten level. Nine percent reported that their student teaching experience was at the K-12 level.

TABLE 1
General Characteristics

Characteristic/Grouping	Number	Relative (Pct)	Adjusted (Pct)
SEX			
Female	137	80.1	80.1
Male	34	19.9	19.9
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	101	59.1	60.1
Married with no children	55	32.2	32.7
Married with children	12	7.0	7.1
No answer	3	1.8	****
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
SIZE OF TOWN SPENT MAJORITY OF LIFE			
On a farm	47	27.5	29.4
Nonfarm country home	6	3.5	3.7
Town less than 2,500	16	9.4	10.0
Town with 2,500 to 5,000	13	7.6	8.1
Town with 5,000 to 50,000	46	26.9	28.7
City over 50,000	32	18.7	20.0
No answer	11	6.4	****
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
INCOME			
Less than \$10,000	46	26.9	29.1
\$10,000-\$19,999	80	46.8	50.6
\$20,000 to \$29,999	25	14.6	15.8
\$30,000 to \$49,999	7	4.1	4.4
No answer	13	7.6	****
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0

TABLE 2
Teaching Characteristics

Characteristic/Grouping	Number	Relative (Pct)	Adjusted (Pct)
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT			
Teaching	107	62.6	62.6
Nonteaching	62	36.3	36.3
Unemployed	2	1.2	1.2
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
LEVEL OF STUDENT TEACHING			
Nursery/Kindergarten	20	11.7	11.7
Elementary	52	30.4	30.4
Secondary	83	48.5	48.5
K-12	16	9.4	9.4
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
K-12 CERTIFIED AREA			
Art	8	50.0	50.0
Health and physical education	2	12.5	12.5
Music	4	25.0	25.0
Physical education	2	12.5	22.5
TOTAL	16	100.0	100.0

Thirty-three percent of the 83 respondents who prepared at the secondary level indicated that they had approval in more than one area (Table 3). Four specified three areas, 23 listed two areas and 56 listed one area; taken together, the 83 graduates mentioned 114 different teaching approval areas. The most frequently mentioned area was home economics.

TABLE 3
Approval Areas (Secondary)

Area	Number	% Of Responses (R=114*)	% Of Cases (N=83**)
AGRICULTURE	13	11.4	15.7
FINE ARTS	1	0.9	1.2
Music	1	0.9	1.2
HOME ECONOMICS	26	22.8	31.3
HUMANITIES/LANGUAGE	20	17.6	24.1
English	9	7.9	10.8
Foreign language	5	4.4	6.0
Journalism	3	2.6	3.6
Speech	3	2.6	3.6
INDUSTRIAL ARTS	9	7.9	10.8
Industrial arts	6	5.3	7.2
Safety education	3	2.6	3.6
PHYSICAL/HEALTH EDUCATION	19	16.7	22.9
Health education	9	7.9	10.8
Physical education	10	8.8	12.0
SCIENCE/MATHEMATICS	17	14.9	20.5
Biology	5	4.4	6.0
General science	6	5.3	7.2
Mathematics	5	4.4	6.0
Physics	1	0.9	1.2
SOCIAL SCIENCE	9	7.9	10.8
Psychology	3	2.6	3.6
Social studies	6	5.3	7.2

* In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "% of Responses" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

**The "% Of Cases" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option.

GRADUATES EMPLOYED IN TEACHING

Forty-one percent of the 107 respondents with teaching positions reported being employed at the secondary level, whereas 31 percent were employed at the elementary level. Fifteen percent were employed at the nursery/kindergarten level and three percent at the K-12 level (Table 4). Seventy-seven percent of those teaching were teaching full time, with nine percent teaching part time and 14 percent substitute teaching. Ninety-one percent of the respondents teaching indicated that they planned to teach the following year with 63 percent planning to stay in the same teaching position. Seven percent of the respondents who were currently teaching indicated that they planned to leave the field of education the following year.

When asked to indicate what subject areas they were currently teaching, the 44 secondary teachers supplied 61 responses, indicating that several were teaching in more than one area (Table 5). Four were teaching in three areas, 10 were teaching in two areas, 29 in one area and one did not respond to the question. Of these 44 teachers, two had listed three approval areas, 10 had listed two areas and the remainder had listed one.

Humanities/language and science/mathematics were the two major subject areas most frequently mentioned when the teachers were asked what subject areas they were currently teaching. Twenty-five percent were teaching in the area of humanities/language and 23 percent were teaching in science/mathematics. Twenty percent of the teachers reported that they were teaching home economics, the third most frequently mentioned area.

TABLE 4

Teachers' Current Employment Status and Plans

Characteristic/Grouping	Number	Relative (Pct)	Adjusted (Pct)
TEACHING LEVEL			
Nursery/Kindergarten	16	15.0	15.0
Elementary	33	30.8	30.8
Secondary	44	41.1	41.1
K-12	3	2.8	2.8
Nursery & elementary	2	1.9	1.9
All	8	7.5	7.5
Adult handicapped	1	0.9	0.9
TOTAL	107	100.0	100.0
TEACHING TIME			
Full-time	81	75.7	77.1
Part-time	9	8.4	8.6
Substitute	15	14.0	14.3
No answer	2	1.9	****
TOTAL	107	100.0	100.0
PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR			
Remain in same position	63	58.9	63.0
Seek similar position in different school	25	23.4	25.0
Have accepted similar position in different school	3	2.8	3.0
Employment in education other than teaching	2	1.9	2.0
Employment outside education	7	6.5	7.0
No answer	7	6.5	****
TOTAL	107	100.0	100.0

TABLE 5
Subject Areas Being Taught (Secondary)

Area	Number	% Of Responses (R=61*)	% Of Cases (N=44**)
AGRICULTURE	4	6.6	9.3
FINE ARTS	4	6.6	9.3
Art	1	1.6	2.3
Music	3	4.9	7.0
HOME ECONOMICS	12	19.7	27.9
HUMANITIES/LANGUAGE	15	24.6	34.9
English	7	11.5	16.3
Foreign language	1	1.6	2.3
Journalism	2	3.3	4.7
Language arts	2	3.3	4.7
Reading	1	1.6	2.3
Speech/Drama	2	3.3	4.7
INDUSTRIAL ARTS	4	6.6	9.3
PHYSICAL/HEALTH EDUCATION	2	3.3	4.7
Health education	1	1.6	2.3
Physical education	1	1.6	2.3
SCIENCE/MATHEMATICS	14	23.0	32.6
Biology	2	3.3	4.7
Chemistry	2	3.3	4.7
Mathematics	4	6.6	9.3
Science	6	9.8	14.0
SOCIAL SCIENCE	2	3.3	4.7
History	2	3.3	4.7
OTHER	4	6.6	9.3
Substitute teaching	2	3.3	4.7
Special education	1	1.6	2.3
Media	1	1.6	2.3

* In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "% of Responses" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

**The "% Of Cases" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option.

Additional analysis of the data presented in Tables 3 and 4 reveals the following information: Forty-four of the graduates were teaching at the secondary level, but five of these 44 prepared at the K-12 level. Three of these five teachers were teaching music at the secondary level and two were teaching art. Five graduates who had prepared at the secondary level reported that they were teaching in a combination of elementary and secondary levels.

When subjects that graduates were teaching at the secondary level are compared with their listed approval areas at the time of graduation, it appears that the large majority of graduates were teaching in either these approval areas or closely related areas. (For example, the two graduates who reported that they were currently teaching chemistry had approval in general science and biology). Four of the 44 graduates teaching at the secondary level reported that they were teaching in areas which they did not list as approval areas. These four included a graduate with an approval in agriculture teaching mathematics and three graduates with approval in home economics. One of the home economics graduates was teaching science, one was teaching special education and the third was teaching a combination of special education, history and mathematics.

Thirty-eight of the 52 graduates who had prepared to teach at the elementary level reported that they were currently employed in teaching. Thirty-three of these were employed at the elementary level, three were employed at the nursery-kindergarten level, and two were teaching at both the elementary and secondary levels.

Of the 16 graduates who had prepared to teach at the K-12 level, 10 were teaching. Five of these were teaching at the secondary level, three at the K-12 level, one was teaching adult handicapped, and one was teaching at the elementary level.

Fifteen of the 20 graduates who had prepared to teach at the nursery-kindergarten level were employed in teaching. Thirteen of these were teaching at the nursery-kindergarten level only, one was teaching special education at the elementary level, and one was teaching physical education at both the elementary and secondary levels. Of the 13 teaching at the nursery-kindergarten level, eight indicated nursery-kindergarten only as their teaching area and five indicated both special education and nursery-kindergarten.

GRADUATES EMPLOYED OUTSIDE TEACHING

Of the graduates who reported employment outside teaching, the majority held professional or managerial positions (Table 6). These graduates were also asked to give their reasons for not teaching at the time of the study with the instructions to check all that apply. The most frequently mentioned reason was that no job was found in the desired location, followed by better pay in a non-teaching position, and had not planned to teach.

Graduates employed outside the field of education were also asked about their plans for next year and their long-range career plans (Tables 6 and 7). In regard to plans for next year, 25 percent of these graduates indicated that they had secured or planned to seek a teaching position. When asked about long-range career plans, 52 percent

TABLE 6

Non-Teachers' Current Employment Status and Career Plans

Characteristic/Grouping	Number	Relative (Pct)	Adjusted (Pct)
CURRENT OCCUPATION			
Professional & technical	21	32.8	32.8
Managers & officials	14	21.9	21.9
Clerical	6	9.4	9.4
Graduate student	5	7.8	7.8
Homemaker	4	6.3	6.3
Salesworkers	4	6.3	6.3
Service & private household	3	4.7	4.7
Laborers	2	3.1	3.1
Craftsmen & foremen	1	1.6	1.6
Operatives	1	1.6	1.6
Farm laborers & foremen	1	1.6	1.6
Unemployed	2	3.1	****
TOTAL	64	100.0	100.0
REASONS FOR NOT TEACHING			
No job in ideal location	25	25.3	41.0
Better pay in non-teaching	22	22.2	36.1
Had not planned to teach	17	17.1	27.9
Teacher education program experience	12	12.1	19.7
Marriage/family obligation	11	11.1	18.0
No job anywhere	7	7.1	11.5
Graduate study	5	5.1	8.2
EMPLOYMENT PLANS FOR NEXT YEAR			
Position outside education	47	73.4	74.6
Seeking teaching position	15	23.4	23.8
Obtained teaching position	1	1.6	1.6
No answer	1	1.6	****
TOTAL	64	100.0	100.0

TABLE 7
Non-Teachers' Long-Range Plans

Characteristic/Grouping	Number	Relative (Pct)	Adjusted (Pct)
LONG-RANGE CAREER PLANS			
Teaching only	16	25.0	25.8
Non-teaching position in education	9	14.1	14.5
Teaching and non-teaching position in education	5	7.8	8.1
Teaching and position outside education	2	3.1	3.2
Position outside education	30	46.9	48.4
No answer	2	3.1	****
TOTAL	64	100.0	100.0
LONG-RANGE NONEDUCATION PLAN (N=32)			
Own business	6	18.8	18.8
Medical field	3	9.4	9.4
Food services	3	9.4	9.4
Corporate management	3	9.4	9.4
Banking/loan	3	9.4	9.4
Agriculture	2	6.3	6.3
Computer science	2	6.3	6.3
Editing-journalism	2	6.3	6.3
Home economics	2	6.3	6.3
Military	2	6.3	6.3
Juvenile justice	1	3.1	3.1
Laboratory technology	1	3.1	3.1
Landscape architecture	1	3.1	3.1
Transportation	1	3.1	3.1
TOTAL	32	100.0	100.0

indicated that their plans included teaching or an education-related position. Forty-eight percent of the respondents who were not currently teaching indicated that their long-range career plans would remain outside the field of education. Of these respondents who planned to continue in careers outside the field of education, 19 percent indicated an interest in owning their own business. Other frequently mentioned fields included banking, corporate management, food services, and medicine.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Graduates were asked several questions about their current evaluation of the teacher education program. Responses to a general question about their overall satisfaction with the program indicated that a majority of the graduates (61%) rated their satisfaction with the program in the seven or above range on a 10-point scale with "0" being the lowest rating and "10" the highest (Table 8). Nine percent of the graduates rated the quality of the program below the middle range, whereas none of the respondents rated the quality as very poor. Sixty-one percent of the graduates replied that they would choose teaching again for a career if they had the choice to make over. Twenty percent were undecided about the choice of teaching as a career and 19 percent would not choose it again. About two-thirds reported that the length of their student teaching experience was about right and 29 percent suggested that the experience should have been longer. Two percent suggested it should have been shorter.

TABLE 8
Evaluations of Teacher Education

Item/Response	Number	Relative (Pct)	Adjusted (Pct)
QUALITY OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGAM			
Very high (10)	3	1.8	1.8
7 thru 9	97	56.7	58.8
4 thru 6	51	29.8	30.9
1 thru 3	14	8.2	8.5
Very poor (0)	0	0.0	0.0
No answer	6	3.5	****
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
WOULD YOU PREPARE TO BE A TEACHER AGAIN?			
Yes	102	59.6	61.1
No	32	18.7	19.2
Undecided	33	19.3	19.8
No answer	4	2.3	****
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
LENGTH OF STUDENT TEACHING			
Longer	50	29.2	29.2
Shorter	4	2.3	2.3
About right	117	68.4	68.4
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0

In an open-ended format, graduates were asked to list the three most valuable portions of their teacher education programs. The answers supplied by the respondents were coded into five major categories with each major category containing several sub-categories. The major area most frequently mentioned by the respondents involved field experience (Table 9). The second most frequently mentioned major category was specific courses and instructors. Within this category, methods courses, involvement in the total program, quality of instructors, and views of professional issues were the most frequently mentioned sub-categories. The third most frequently mentioned major category involved specific topics and activities and within this category, planning skills and use of media were the most frequently mentioned.

Graduates were also asked in what ways the program could have offered more preparation; the respondents most frequently mentioned the major area involving specific topics and activities (Table 10): Within this category the most frequently mentioned sub-categories were discipline and classroom management techniques and techniques for working with students with special needs. Testing and evaluation procedures and knowledge of varieties of activities were also frequent responses within this category. The second most frequently listed major category needing improvement involved professional situations/relationships. Within this category, more emphasis on the realities of the actual job experience and more experience working with parents were the most frequently listed items. The third most frequently mentioned major category needing improvement involved improving and increasing field experiences.

TABLE 9

Most Valuable Professional Preparation Areas

Area/Topic	Number	% Of Responses (R=347*)	% Of Cases (N=153**)
FIELD EXPERIENCE	101	29.2	66.0
Student teaching	54	15.6	35.3
Actual experience with children	27	7.8	17.6
Other	20	5.8	13.1
COURSES/INSTRUCTORS	98	28.1	64.1
Methods courses	19	5.5	12.4
Quality of instructors	14	4.0	9.2
Appreciation of professional issues	14	4.0	9.2
Involvement in total program	13	3.7	8.5
Teaching methods for individualized instruction	12	3.5	7.8
Psychology of learning	9	2.6	5.9
Developmental courses	6	1.7	3.9
Multi-cultural studies	6	1.7	3.9
CUTE Program	5	1.4	3.3
SPECIALITIES/ACTIVITIES	87	25.1	57.0
Planning lesson/units	39	11.2	25.5
Use of media	14	4.0	9.2
Human relations and communication	11	3.2	7.2
Teaching reading and language arts	7	2.0	4.6
Peer and micro teaching	5	1.4	3.3
Leadership roles and functions of administrators	4	1.2	2.6
Discipline techniques	3	0.9	2.0
Special education techniques	2	0.6	1.3
Experience in public speaking	2	0.6	1.3

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Most Valuable Professional Preparation Areas

Area/Topic	Number	% Of Responses (R=347*)	% Of Cases (N=153**)
CONTENT AREA PREPARATION	50	14.4	32.7
General preparation in curriculum in content area	37	10.7	24.2
Methods in content areas	13	3.7	8.5
RESOURCES	11	3.2	7.2
Knowledge of material resources	2	0.6	1.3
Availability of materials and people	7	2.0	4.6
Placement office	2	0.6	1.3

* In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "% of Responses" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

**The "% Of Cases" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option. Eighteen did not answer the question.

TABLE 10

Areas In Which More Preparation Should Have Been Offered

Area/Topic	Number	% Of Responses (R=325*)	% Of Cases (N=147**)
SPECIFIC TOPICS/ACTIVITIES	155	47.8	105.5
Discipline techniques	50	15.4	34.0
Training in working with special needs students	31	9.5	21.1
Testing and evaluation procedures	21	6.5	14.3
Varieties of activities	20	6.2	13.6
Lesson planning	12	3.7	8.2
Motivation	8	2.5	5.4
Less emphasis on specific lesson plans	1	0.3	0.7
Other	12	3.7	8.2
PROFESSIONAL SITUATIONS/RELATIONSHIPS	59	18.0	40.3
Realities of job situation	17	5.2	11.6
Experience working with parents	16	4.9	10.9
Developing a philosophy of teaching and professional ethics	7	2.2	4.8
Alternative careers	6	1.8	4.1
Experience working with other teachers, administrators, etc.	6	1.8	4.1
Politics of teaching	4	1.2	2.7
Certification requirements	2	0.6	1.4
Other	1	0.3	0.7
FIELD EXPERIENCE	53	16.3	36.1
Classroom experience prior to student teaching	36	11.1	24.5
Longer student teaching	10	3.1	6.8
Opportunity to observe variety of teachers	5	1.5	3.4
Other	2	0.6	1.4

TABLE 10 (Continued)

Areas in Which More Preparation Should Have Been Offered

Area/Topic	Number	% Of Responses (R=325*)	% Of Cases (N=147**)
COURSES/INSTRUCTORS	41	12.5	28.0
Alternate methods of teaching	19	5.8	12.9
Education courses	7	2.2	4.8
Advising on program requirements during freshman and sophomore years	6	1.8	4.1
Instructors	5	1.5	3.4
Courses	2	0.6	1.4
Textbooks	2	0.6	1.4
CONTENT AREA PREPARATION	17	5.2	11.6
More mathematics and science preparation (Elementary)	11	3.4	7.5
More preparation in content area	5	1.5	3.4
Other	1	0.3	0.7

* In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "% of Responses" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

**The "% Of Cases" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option. Twenty-four did not answer the question.

EVALUATIONS OF SELECTED AREAS

Graduates were asked to rate both the adequacy and importance of various aspects of the teacher education program (Table 11). In addition to the adequacy and importance means, the differences between these means are presented in Table 11. Rank orders of the means for the adequacy and importance ratings are also presented; it should be noted that the graduates were not asked to rank the factors on either adequacy or importance. These orders were obtained by assigning the numbers 1 (highest mean) to 24 (lowest mean) to the mean ratings of the graduates.

When asked to rate the adequacy of their preparation, graduates rated content preparation, ability to use media, planning skills, knowledge of psychology and appreciation of intergroup differences as the five top areas. The areas receiving below average adequacy ratings (below three on a five-point scale) were: diagnosis of learning disabilities, methods of dealing with emotionally disturbed, understanding and dealing with behavior problems, skill in working with parents and methods of dealing with learning problems.

In terms of importance, graduates rated understanding and dealing with behavior problems, maintaining student interest, relating activities to student interests, planning skills and skill in working with parents as the five top areas. All five of these areas received composite ratings above 4.3 on the five point scale.

In general, means for the adequacy ratings of the professional preparation areas were lower than the means for the importance ratings.

Whereas the average score for the means on importance of the various areas was 4.15 and the range of the means was from 3.79 to 4.65, the average score of the means for adequacy was 3.53 with a range from 2.46 to 4.07. In no case did graduates rate the adequacy of preparation in a particular area as significantly greater than the importance of the area.

The differences between the adequacy and importance ratings are presented in the last column of Table 11. The most significant differences (all with importance ratings higher than adequacy ratings) occur in the following areas: understanding and dealing with behavior problems, skill in working with parents, diagnosis of learning disabilities, maintaining student interest, and methods of dealing with learning problems. The areas exhibiting the least difference between adequacy and importance ratings were: knowledge of psychology, use of standardized tests, ability to use media, content preparation, appreciation of intergroup differences, and comprehension of professional ethics and legal obligations. In the summary and conclusions section, more discussion is presented on the interpretation of these differences between adequacy and importance ratings.

TABLE 11

Adequacy And Importance For Preparation Areas

Preparation Areas	A. Adequacy ^a		B. Importance ^b		Difference ^c A-B
	Mean (N)	Order	Mean (N)	Order	
Planning units of instruction and individual lessons	3.87 (149)	3	4.31 (138)	4.5	-.45* (137)
Ability to prepare and use instructional media and equipment	3.88 (150)	2	3.87 (142)	18	.05 (142)
Maintaining student interest in classroom activities	3.30 (149)	16	4.64 (141)	2	-1.31* (140)
Understanding and dealing with behavior problems-classroom	2.68 (149)	22	4.65 (139)	1	-1.95* (139)
Methods of dealing with emotionally disturbed	2.54 (141)	23	3.79 (128)	22.5	-1.23* (127)
Methods of dealing with learning problems	2.77 (149)	20	4.10 (139)	15	-1.27* (138)
Diagnosis of learning disabilities	2.46 (143)	24	3.92 (129)	16	-1.45* (129)
Skill in developing tests	3.39 (145)	14	3.79 (129)	22.5	-.46* (128)
Comprehension and use of standardized tests	3.35 (136)	15	3.26 (123)	24	.08 (121)
Content preparation in your area of specialization	4.07 (143)	1	4.30 (136)	6	-.27* (135)
Comprehension of professional ethics and legal obligations	3.43 (150)	13	3.82 (141)	21	-.43* (140)
Knowledge of psychology of learning and its application to teaching	3.80 (151)	4	3.83 (144)	20	-.04 (144)
Evaluating and reporting student work and achievement	3.44 (151)	12	4.21 (138)	11	-.77* (138)
Relating activities to interests and abilities of students	3.51 (151)	11	4.45 (142)	3	-.91* (142)

TABLE 11 (Continued)

Adequacy and Importance For Preparation Areas

Preparation Areas	A. Adequacy ^a		B. Importance ^b		Difference ^c A-B
	Mean (N)	Order	Mean (N)	Order	
Knowledge of materials and resources in your specialty area	3.73 (146)	6	4.29 (138)	7	-.55*
Evaluating your own instruction	3.58 (151)	9	4.24 (142)	9	-.66*
Individualizing instruction	3.52 (150)	10	4.20 (137)	12	-.69*
Selecting and organizing materials	3.69 (150)	7	4.26 (144)	8	-.57*
Knowledge and skill with different techniques and instruction	3.64 (151)	8	4.22 (144)	10	-.56*
Understanding teachers' roles in relation to administrators, supervisors, and counselors	3.24 (149)	18	3.86 (140)	19	-.60*
Skill in working with parents	2.77 (150)	20.5	4.31 (134)	4.5	-1.53*
Skill in working with other teachers	3.17 (151)	19	4.16 (141)	13	-.99*
Assessing and implementing innovations	3.26 (147)	17	3.88 (140)	17	-.62*
Appreciation of individual and intergroup differences in values and lifestyles	3.75 (150)	5	4.13 (146)	14	-.38*

a Rating scale for adequacy: Very adequate = 5, adequate = 4, neutral = 3, inadequate = 2, very inadequate = 1

b Rating scale for importance: Very important = 5, important = 4, neutral = 3, unimportant = 2, very unimportant = 1

c Difference between importance and adequacy is based on those responding to both adequacy and importance

* Significant difference at .05 level

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS

In addition to items evaluating the teacher education program, graduates were also asked several questions about their current employment. First, graduates were asked to rate the importance of various factors in accepting their current positions. The factor rated the most important by graduates was spouse works in the community, followed by desirable location and type of position (Table 12). It should be noted, however, that 54 of the 171 respondents answered the item involving the spouse's employment; thus it appears that for the majority of the 67 graduates who were married, this was a significant consideration. The item did not apply, however, to the 101 single respondents. The factor rated least important by all the graduates was size of organization.

The large majority of teacher education graduates rated their satisfaction with their current job in the average range or above, with 14 percent rating their job satisfaction below the average range (Table 13).

Almost half (47 percent) of the graduates worked in a community with a population of 10,000 or fewer and 23 percent worked in cities with populations over 50,000.

In response to a question asking the graduates to list the characteristics of the best teacher they have ever had, these teacher education graduates most frequently mentioned attributes related to pupil and classroom management. The second most frequently mentioned characteristics related to the teacher's intelligence and professional behavior (Table 14).

TABLE 12
Factors In Accepting Current Position

Characteristics	Number	Mean*	Std Dev
Desirable location	147	4.17	1.03
Salary offered	144	3.38	1.01
Type of position	144	4.12	0.95
Size of organization	142	3.23	1.07
Reputation of school, firm or organization	138	3.67	1.01
Liked people with whom I interviewed	139	3.92	0.97
Spouse has job in the community	54	4.33	0.14
Only job I was offered	66	3.24	1.47

* Rating scale for importance: Very important=5, important=4, neutral=3, unimportant=2, very unimportant=1. Not applicable and no answer were not included in the calculation of the mean.

TABLE 13

Satisfaction With Current Position And Population Of Community In Which
Graduates Were Employed

Characteristic/Evaluation	Number	Relative (Pct)	Adjusted (Pct)
GENERAL SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT POSITION			
Very high	19	11.1	12.4
7 to 9	88	51.5	57.5
4 to 6	25	14.6	16.3
1 to 3	21	12.3	13.7
No answer/not applicable	18	10.5	****
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0
POPULATION OF COMMUNITY WHERE EMPLOYED			
Under 1,000	18	10.5	11.7
1,000-2,500	23	13.5	14.9
2,500-5,000	17	9.9	11.0
5,000-10,000	15	8.8	9.7
10,000-25,000	17	9.9	11.0
25,000-50,000	29	17.0	18.8
Over 50,000	35	20.5	22.7
No answer/not applicable	17	9.9	****
TOTAL	171	100.0	100.0

TABLE 14
Characteristics Of Best Teacher

Characteristic	Number	% Of Responses (R=446*)	% Of Cases (N=155**)
Student relations	62	13.9	40.0
Intelligent/Professional	104	23.3	67.1
Personal characteristics	50	11.2	32.3
Pupil and class management	129	28.9	83.2
Communicate subject materials	87	19.5	56.1
Interpersonal communications	14	3.1	9.0

* In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "% of Responses" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

**The "% Of Cases" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option. Sixteen respondents did not answer this question.

COMPARISON OF TEACHERS AND NON-TEACHERS ON OCCUPATIONAL VARIABLES

Those graduates who reported they were currently teaching were compared with those who reported they were not teaching on various demographic, program evaluation and occupational characteristics. There were no significant differences between graduates who were teaching and those who were not with respect to grade point average at the time of graduation, high school rank, ACT score, general program rating, and overall satisfaction with current job (Table 15).

TABLE 15

Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Academic, Job and Program Variables

Characteristic/Grouping	Teach		Non-Teach		Difference
	Number	Mean Score	Number	Mean Score	
College graduating G.P.A.	107	3.17	64	3.13	0.04 N.S.
High school rank	94	18.04	56	17.02	1.02 N.S.
ACT	79	23.00	41	23.27	-0.27 N.S.
General satisfaction with current job*	106	7.18	47	6.77	0.41 N.S.
Program rating*	103	6.50	62	6.74	-0.24 N.S.

* Rating scale for these items were 0 thru 10 with 0=very low and 10=very high.

Chi-square results presented in Table 16, however, indicate that there is a significant difference between the teachers and non-teachers in response to the question, "If you had it to do over again, would you prepare to become a teacher?". Seventy-one percent of the teachers reported they would do it over again, whereas 44 percent of the non-teachers reported that they would do it over again.

Although the chi-square results reveal no significant differences at the .05 level between the teachers and non-teachers with respect to sex, college, teaching level, income and size of community in which employed, trends were found at the .10 level of significance (Table 16). With respect to teaching level, 61 percent of the non-teachers prepared

at the secondary level, whereas 22 percent of the non-teachers prepared at the elementary level. Considering the population of the community where the graduates were employed, the graduates who were teaching seem to be fairly evenly distributed according to the major classification for community size. More of the non-teachers, however, reported that they were working in larger communities with 62 percent employed in communities with population over 25,000, whereas 33 percent of the teachers were employed in communities of comparable size.

Several significant differences were also observed in the area of program evaluation between those graduates who reported that they were currently teaching and those employed outside the field of education. When asked to rate the adequacy of their preparation in 24 different areas (see Table 11 for areas), the teachers rated the adequacy of their preparation in dealing with the emotionally disturbed and learning disabled as significantly higher than the non-teachers ($p=.05$). The non-teachers, however, rated the adequacy of their preparation in evaluating student progress significantly higher than the teachers ($p=.05$).

There were also significant differences among the ratings of the importance of various areas of preparation. In all cases of significant differences ($p=.05$), the teachers rated these areas as more important than did the non-teachers: dealing with behavior problems, dealing with learning problems, evaluating student progress, individualizing instruction, understanding own role with respect to supervisors, working with parents, and working with other teachers.

TABLE 16

Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic/Grouping	Teach		Non-Teach		Total	
	Number	(Pct)	Number	(Pct)	Number	(Pct)
SEX						
Female	90	84.1	47	73.4	137	80.1
Male	17	15.9	17	26.6	34	19.9
TOTAL	107	100.0	64	100.0	171	100.0

Chi Square = 2.23 Significance = 0.14

COLLEGE

Agriculture	6	5.6	7	10.9	13	7.6
Design	4	3.7	5	7.8	9	5.3
Education	47	43.9	23	35.9	70	40.9
Home Economics	31	29.0	18	28.1	49	28.7
Science & Humanities	19	17.8	11	17.2	30	17.5
TOTAL	107	100.0	64	100.0	171	100.0

Chi Square = 3.40 Significance = 0.49

STUDENT TEACHING LEVEL

N-K	15	14.0	5	7.8	20	11.7
K-6	38	35.5	14	21.9	52	30.4
7-12	44	41.1	39	60.9	83	48.5
K-12	10	9.3	6	9.4	16	9.4
TOTAL	107	100.0	64	100.0	171	100.0

Chi Square = 7.01 Significance = 0.07

TABLE 16 (Continued)

Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic/Grouping	Teach		Non-Teach		Total	
	Number	(Pct)	Number	(Pct)	Number	(Pct)
POPULATION OF COMMUNITY WHERE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED						
Under 1,000	14	13.1	4	8.5	18	11.7
1,000 - 2,500	17	15.9	6	12.8	23	14.9
2,500 - 5,000	14	13.1	3	6.4	17	11.0
5,000 - 10,000	13	12.1	2	4.3	15	9.7
10,000 - 25,000	14	13.1	3	6.4	17	11.0
25,000 - 50,000	16	15.0	13	27.7	29	18.8
Over 50,000	19	17.8	16	34.0	35	22.7
	---	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL	107	100.0	47	100.0	154*	100.0

Chi Square = 12.15 Significance = 0.06

*17 missing observations

INCOME

Less than \$10,000	28	26.9	18	33.3	46	29.1
\$10,000 - \$19,999	56	53.8	24	44.4	80	50.6
\$20,000 - \$29,999	14	13.5	11	20.4	25	15.8
\$30,000 - \$49,999	6	5.8	1	1.9	7	4.4
	---	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL	104	100.0	54	100.0	158*	100.0

Chi Square = 3.43 Significance = 0.33

*13 missing observations

DO OVER AGAIN

Yes	75	71.4	27	43.5	102	61.1
No	11	10.5	21	33.9	32	19.2
Undecided	19	18.1	14	22.6	33	19.8
	---	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL	105	100.0	62	100.0	167*	100.0

Chi Square = 16.49 Significance = 0.01

*4 missing observations

In Table 17, significant differences between the reported occupational characteristics provided by the current jobs of teachers and those provided by the current jobs of non-teachers are presented. In general, the teachers rated their jobs as providing significantly more opportunities for creativity and originality, challenge, adventure, responsibility and independence than did the non-teachers. Also rated significantly higher by the teachers were opportunity to use special abilities, exercise leadership, help and serve others, and find variety in the work. Job characteristics rated significantly lower by the teachers include opportunity to earn money, relative freedom from supervision, opportunity for advancement, and opportunity for a secure future.

With respect to the importance of various factors in the job selection process, however, no significant differences occurred between the teachers and non-teachers (Table 18).

TABLE 17

Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Occupational Characteristics

Characteristics	A		B		Difference A-B
	Teaching Mean ^a (N)	Order	Non-Teaching Mean ^a (N)	Order	
Opportunity to be creative and original	4.06 (106)	6.5	3.24 (49)	12	.82*
Opportunity to use special abilities or aptitudes	3.82 (106)	9	3.43 (49)	11	.39*
Opportunity to work with people rather than things	4.50 (105)	4	4.39 (49)	1	.11
Opportunity to earn a good deal of money	2.24 (102)	18	2.88 (48)	16	-.64*
Social status and prestige	3.03 (105)	14	2.96 (48)	14	.07
Opportunity to effect social change	2.90 (104)	16	2.67 (48)	17	.23
Relative freedom from supervision by others	3.75 (106)	10	3.13 (48)	13	.62*
Opportunity for advancement	2.46 (105)	17	3.48 (48)	9	1.02*
Opportunity to exercise leadership	3.99 (106)	8	3.44 (48)	10	.55*
Opportunity to help and serve others	4.52 (106)	3	4.12 (49)	3	.40*
Adventure	3.46 (106)	11	2.61 (49)	18	.85*
Opportunity for a relatively stable and secure future	2.98 (103)	15	3.54 (48)	8	-.56*
Fringe benefits (health care, retirement benefits)	3.45 (104)	12	3.79 (48)	5	-.34

TABLE 17 (Continued)

Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Occupational Characteristics

Characteristics	A		B		Difference A-B
	Mean ^a (N)	Teaching Order	Mean ^a (N)	Non-Teaching Order	
Responsibility	4.67 (106)	1	4.18 (49)	2	.49*
Control over what I do	4.36 (106)	5	3.73 (48)	6	.63*
Control over what others do	3.22 (106)	13	2.94 (48)	15	.28
Challenge	4.56 (106)	2	3.86 (49)	4	.70*

a Rating scale for importance: Very important = 5, important = 4, neutral = 3, unimportant = 2, very unimportant = 1

* Significant difference at .05 level

TABLE 18

Teachers Versus Non-Teachers on Job Selection Factors

ITEM	A		B		Difference ^b A-B
	Teaching	Order	Non-Teaching	Order	
	Mean ^a (N)		Mean ^a (N)		
JOB SELECTION FACTORS					
Desirable location	4.27 (104)	2	3.93 (43)	3	0.34
Salary offered	3.30 (103)	7	3.56 (41)	6	-0.26
Type of position	4.15 (101)	3	4.07 (43)	2	0.08
Size of organization	3.19 (99)	8	3.33 (43)	7	-0.14
Reputation of school, firm or organization	3.58 (99)	5	3.90 (39)	4	-0.32
Liked people with whom I interviewed	4.02 (99)	4	3.68 (40)	5	0.34
Spouse has job in the community	4.37 (35)	1	4.26 (19)	1	0.11
Only job I was offered	3.43 (47)	6	2.79 (19)	8	0.64

a Rating scale for importance: Very important=5, important=4, neutral=3, unimportant=2, very unimportant=1. Not applicable and no answer were not included in the calculation of the mean.

b None of the differences were statistically different at .05 level.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Data on teacher education program evaluation, current and future employment plans and characteristics of current positions were collected from 64 percent of the Spring, 1980 Iowa State teacher education graduates one year after their graduation. Comparisons between respondents and non-respondents indicated that the respondents to the 1981 study were a representative group of the Spring 1980 graduates with respect to academic, program and occupational characteristics (Appendix).

Sixty-three percent of the respondents reported that they were currently teaching and the large majority of these reported that they intended to remain in teaching. Of the graduates who were not currently teaching, half reported that their long-range plans remained in the field of education. Thus, 81 percent of the respondents reported plans to pursue education as a career. Graduates employed outside the field of education indicated that the inability to find a position in the desired location was the most frequent reason for not teaching, followed by better pay in a non-teaching position. No job in any location was selected as a reason for not teaching by seven percent of the respondents. It appears that both location and salary considerations were important factors for the graduates employed outside education.

When rating their professional preparation program in general, a large majority of the graduates rated the program in the average

category or above. Nine percent of the graduates rated the program below the average category.

In general, the teacher education graduates indicated satisfaction with the length of their student teaching experience. Of the graduates expressing dissatisfaction (32%), 95 percent suggested that the experience should be longer and five percent suggested that it be shorter. The graduates most frequently cited field experiences and methods courses as the most valuable parts of the teacher education program. Discipline techniques, working with the handicapped, field experiences prior to student teaching, testing and evaluation procedures and providing a variety of activities were the most frequently cited areas when the graduates were asked to list areas in the program needing improvement.

Graduates were also asked to rate both the importance and adequacy of various specific parts of the teacher education program. In general, graduates rated the importance of these areas higher than the adequacy of preparation in each of the areas. The highest discrepancies between ratings on importance and adequacy occurred in dealing with behavior problems, working with parents and diagnosing the learning disabled. In all of these areas, importance was rated significantly higher than adequacy. All of these "high discrepancy" areas involve the realities of working with children and adults in the school situation.

The lowest discrepancies occurred in ability to use media, comprehension and use of standardized tests, knowledge of psychology, and content area preparation. In these four areas, graduates seemed to feel very adequately prepared (three of the four areas are among the

four areas receiving the highest adequacy ratings). In these four areas, then, graduates tended to rate the importance of their preparation as about the same as the adequacy of their preparation in the area. It appears that these areas where the graduates felt well prepared were not problem areas for them and thus were not rated as important as the more people-oriented discrepancy areas mentioned previously.

The graduates who reported they were teaching differed significantly from the non-teachers in their response to a question asking if they would prepare to become a teacher again if they had the decision to make over. Seventy-one percent of the teachers responded affirmatively compared to 44 percent of the non-teachers who responded affirmatively. Although not statistically significant, trends were also observed which indicated that proportionately more non-teaching graduates prepared at the secondary level than at the elementary level and that non-teachers were more frequently employed in larger towns than were the teachers. Graduates with teaching positions reported that their jobs provided significantly greater opportunities for challenge, creativity, and use of special abilities than did the non-teachers. The teacher-graduates also reported significantly fewer opportunities for financial rewards, job security, and power and prestige than did the non-teachers. Thus, in general these results indicate that the teaching graduates view their jobs as generally more stimulating whereas the non-teachers view their jobs as more financially rewarding.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this study was made possible by the contributions of many people. Collecting current addresses for the graduates was a difficult task requiring the cooperation of several offices. The personnel in the Alumni office, the College of Education Placement office and the College of Education Student Services office all aided in the search for these addresses.

We also wish to acknowledge the members of the Research Institute for Studies in Education for their many and varied inputs to every phase of the project. Those RISE personnel involved in the study included Terry Franco, D. Ann Jimmar and Pat Marlow.

We are also especially appreciative to the teacher education graduates who took time to complete the questionnaire. Their cooperation in completing the questionnaire provided information that will be useful in planning to meet the needs of both current and future teacher education students.

Appendix

RESPONDENTS COMPARED WITH NON-RESPONDENTS

Initially, respondents were compared with non-respondents with respect to academic and program characteristics. Of the 268 graduates to whom questionnaires were mailed in 1980 and 1981, 130 responded both to the 1980 and 1981 surveys; 81 responded to one of the surveys; and 49 responded to neither survey. When these three groups were compared on academic characteristics, no significant differences at the .05 level were found with respect to graduating grade point average and ACT scores (Table 19). There was, however, a significant difference on high school rank between the 130 graduates who responded both times and the other two groups, with graduates who responded both times ranking slightly higher in their high school graduating classes.

When the three groups were compared with respect to college and teaching level, no significant differences were observed (Table 20). Comparing the three groups with respect to sex, however, a significant difference was observed. While 75 percent of the 268 graduates receiving questionnaires were female, 82 percent of those who responded both times were female. Seventy percent of those responding to one of the two surveys were female and 67 percent of those responding neither time were female. Chi square results on these figures yield a value of 6.63, which is significant at the .05 level. Thus, a significant trend for females to respond to both surveys was observed.

TABLE 19

Respondents Compared With Non-Respondents on Academic Characteristics

Item/Return Pattern	Number	Mean
ACT		
Returned both questionnaires	92	23.45
Returned one questionnaire	62	23.48
Returned neither	29	22.93
F ratio = 0.18 F probability = 0.83		
HIGH SCHOOL RANK		
Returned both questionnaires	112	16.61
Returned one questionnaire	80	19.50
Returned neither	33	23.67
F ratio = 13.07 F probability = 0.05		
GRADUATING GRADE POINT AVERAGE		
Returned both questionnaires	130	3.18
Returned one questionnaire	89	3.12
Returned neither	49	3.11
F ratio = 1.048 F probability = 0.35		

TABLE 20

Respondents Compared With Non-Respondents on Selected Characteristics

Characteristic/Grouping	Return of Questionnaires			Total
	Both	One	None	
	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)
SEX				
Female	107 (82.3)	62 (69.7)	33 (67.3)	202 (75.4)
Male	23 (17.7)	27 (30.3)	16 (32.7)	66 (24.6)
TOTAL	130 (100.0)	89 (100.0)	49 (100.0)	268 (100.0)

Chi Square = 6.63 Significance = 0.04

COLLEGE

Agriculture	8 (6.2)	12 (13.5)	4 (8.2)	24 (9.0)
Design	5 (3.8)	5 (5.6)	3 (6.1)	13 (4.9)
Education	60 (46.2)	27 (30.3)	23 (46.9)	110 (41.0)
Home Economics	35 (26.9)	25 (28.1)	8 (16.3)	68 (25.4)
Science & Humanities	22 (16.9)	20 (22.5)	11 (22.4)	53 (19.8)
TOTAL	130 (100.0)	89 (100.0)	49 (100.0)	268 (100.0)

Chi Square = 10.48 Significance = 0.23

TABLE 20 (Continued)

Respondents Compared With Non-Respondents on Selected Characteristics

Characteristic/Grouping	Return of Questionnaires			Total
	Both	One	None	
	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)
TEACHING LEVEL				
Nursery/Kindergarten	11 (8.5)	11 (12.4)	4 (8.2)	26 (9.7)
Elementary	44 (33.8)	21 (23.6)	14 (28.6)	79 (29.5)
Secondary	68 (52.3)	46 (51.7)	22 (44.9)	136 (50.7)
K-12	7 (5.4)	11 (12.4)	9 (18.4)	27 (10.1)
TOTAL	130 (100.0)	89 (100.0)	49 (100.0)	268 (100.0)

Chi Square = 9.93 Significance = 0.13

TRANSFER INFORMATION

Transfer	29 (22.3)	23 (25.8)	18 (36.7)	70 (26.1)
Non-Transfer	101 (77.7)	66 (74.2)	31 (63.3)	198 (73.9)
TOTAL	130 (100.0)	89 (100.0)	49 (100.0)	268 (100.0)

Chi Square = 3.84 Significance = 0.15

In addition to comparing the graduates on academic measures, respondents and non-respondents were compared regarding their current employment, specifically on whether or not they were teaching. One might conjecture that a greater proportion of teachers would return such a survey than would people currently employed outside the field of education. Although data were not available on the current employment for the non-respondents to the 1981 questionnaire, it was possible to compare return rates for the 1980 survey for those who reported that they would be teaching in 1981 with those who reported employment plans outside the field of education (Table 21). Of the 171 respondents in the 1981 follow-up study, 130 had also responded in 1980; 15 were not included in the study in 1980² and 26 had been included but had not responded in 1980. Chi-square results comparing the 1980 respondents, the 1980 non-respondents, and those not included in 1980, on whether or not they were teaching in 1981 indicated no significant differences. Thus, at least with respect to the 1980 survey, it appears that there was not a significant difference between respondents and non-respondents in regard to their current teaching and non-teaching activities. While it is impossible to report employment patterns for the non-respondents in the 1981 follow-up study, the available data indicate that, at least at the time of graduation, there was not a significant difference in the return rates for those who would go into teaching and those who would pursue other careers.

² The initial mailing to graduates is from a preliminary graduation list prepared two months prior to graduation.

TABLE 21

Teaching Status In 1981 Compared With Response To Questionnaire In 1980

Characteristic/Grouping	Returned	Not Returned	Not Mailed	Total
	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)	Number (Pct)
TEACHING	80 (61.5)	17 (65.4)	10 (66.7)	107 (62.6)
NOT TEACHING	50 (38.5)	9 (34.6)	5 (33.3)	64 (37.4)
TOTAL	130 (100.0)	26 (100.0)	15 (100.0)	171 (100.0)

Chi Square = 0.25 Significance = 0.88